

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

C1
computer system to generate output signals, the output signals including video signals and being transmittable from the remote portion of the split personal computer system to the accessory unit, and transmittable from the accessory unit to the display unit.

¹⁸
~~36.~~ (New) A system as defined in claim ¹⁷~~35~~, wherein the remote system controller is programmed with a billing program which counts the time periods in which the accessory unit is connected to at least one of the remote computer units.

REMARKS

Allowance of Claims 23-34

In the Office Action, claims 23-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 25-34 were allowed. The indication of allowability of claims 23-24, and the allowance of claims 25-34 is acknowledged with appreciation.

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

Claims 23-24 have been rewritten as newly added claims 35-36.

Summary of the Invention

As background, many people currently use several computers in the execution of their job duties. For example, an individual may have one computer located at work, another computer located in an office at home, and yet another computer which is portable to use when the individual is neither at work nor at home. The quickly changing technology in the computer area constantly requires consumers to upgrade their computer systems to meet their demands. This means that the individual must separately upgrade the software and hardware on each of the office computer, the home computer and the portable computer. To upgrade all three computers requires three separate software licenses and hardware items which are costly.

The goal of the split personal computer system of claims 1 and 18-22 is to solve the problems associated with the 1) fast obsolescence of personal computer models and operating systems; 2) increasing demand for more memory and speed; 3) constant upgrades of software programs; and 4) need for computer portability by more and

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

more people. (See Pages 2 and 3 of the patent application.) From the standpoint of the user, the inventive concept of claims 1 and 18-22 in effect converts the personal computer industry from a hardware and software product industry to a service industry. That is, the split personal computer system of claims 1 and 18-22 provides a service to at least one user and preferably a large number of users such that the user(s) do not have to purchase an entire personal computer system. The user(s) only have to purchase or obtain a "local portion" and sign up with a service provider, such as AOL, to provide the "remote portion". The split personal computer system of claims 1 and 18-22 provides the user with the functionality of a personal computer without the user having to constantly upgrade various components, such as the CPU, memory, or software.

For example, once the user signs up with the service provider, the user is no longer concerned with many of the problems set forth above. The user does not care whether Intel or AMD have come out with a new chip; it is the service provider's job to maintain an adequate amount of processing power. Likewise, the user does not care how much memory the remote portion has; it is the service provider's job to maintain an adequate amount of memory. As a practical matter, the user is

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

mainly concerned about who to complain to if the split personal computer system is to slow.

Although the user can modify or install the user's own application programs on the remote portion of the split personal computer system, it is also envisioned that the service provider will maintain various personal computer application programs for access by the remote portion. The personal computer application programs could be MS Word, Quattro Pro, or WordPerfect to name but a few. This in effect eliminates various problems associated with upgrades for the application programs maintained by the service provider.

Moreover, as discussed in the patent application, the local portion of claims 1, and 18-22 can optionally be provided as a portable unit. In this instance, the split personal computer system of claims 1 and 18-22 also solves the problems related to computer portability. All the user needs to carry is the local portion, which can communicate with the remote portion via any convenient manner, such as telephone lines, radio links, cable links, wireless telephone links or the like.

In certain instances the local portion of the split personal computer system is adapted to solely perform the video and the input/output portions of the personal

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

computer tasks so that an individual manipulating the local portion of the split personal computer system is provided with the illusion of utilizing a complete personal computer system. For example, the local portion can be a personal computer having communication software thereon for communicating with a remote portion of the split personal computer system. In this instance, the personal computer may solely perform the video and the input/output portions of the personal computer tasks when acting as a local portion of the split personal computer system, even though the personal computer functioning as the local portion is capable of performing other tasks.

None of the references of record are believed to disclose, teach or even suggest Applicant's inventive concept as set forth in claims 1 and 18-22.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Naiff, U.S. Patent No. 5,982,363.

Naiff discloses a personal computer based set-top converter for television services. A peripheral device is provided for a personal computer enabling the PC

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

to provide the functions of a set-top box for television reception. Communication of television and control signals between the television and the PC can be provided over the cable wiring already provided in the subscriber premises. Alternatively, wireless communication can be provided between the television and the PC.

The inventive concept of claim 1 (and thus claims 18-22 which depend therefrom), on the other hand, recites a split personal computer system for selectively processing video portions, input/output portions, computational portions and storage portions of personal computer tasks. The split personal computer system includes (among other elements):

- a remote portion adapted to selectively perform the computational portions and the storage portions of the personal computer tasks;
- a local portion remotely located with respect to the remote portion and adapted to selectively perform the video portions and the input/output portions of the personal computer tasks; and
- communication means for interfacing the accessory unit with the remote portion of the split personal computer system . . .

C

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

As the Examiner is aware, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) requires that the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. (See MPEP 2131) Please note that neither the Applicant nor Applicant's attorney ever conceived of the local portion and the remote portion of the split personal computer system positioned in a same home. This fact is emphasized in claim 1 with the use of the "communication means" for interfacing the accessory unit with the remote portion of the split personal computer system. That is, consistent with the examples of the communication means provided in the Specification, i.e. a telephone network controller, or a television network controller, the communication means refers to a large offsite communication system, such as a telephone network controller, a television network controller, the Internet or combinations thereof.

Naiff, on the other hand only discloses the use of home wiring or low power rf signals for communication between the user interface module 24 and the personal computer 20. Thus, Naiff does not teach or suggest a communication means or an equivalent thereof for interfacing an accessory unit with the remote portion of the split personal computer system, as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and thus each of

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

the claims that depend therefrom. For this reason alone, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 18-22 are not anticipated by the Naiff reference.

It is also the Applicant's belief that the communication means defined in claims 1 and 18-22 and described in the Specification specifies that the remote portion and local portion of the split personal computer system be spaced a large distance apart. The user interface module 24 and the personal computer 20 of Naiff, on the other hand, are located in close proximity to each other. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Naiff does not teach or suggest a remote portion, as such term is defined in claims 1 and 18-22.

Moreover, nothing in the Naiff reference addresses or solves any of the problems solved by the inventive concept of claims 1 and 18-22. For example, assuming that one purchased the system of Naiff; who is responsible for upgrading the CPU, operating system, application programs or the memory of the personal computer? In Naiff, the user is responsible for upgrading all aspects of the personal computer. For example, as a practical matter, a couple of years after purchasing the personal computer, the user of the Naiff system is likely to be upgrading the personal computer. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Naiff does not disclose

C

Applicant: Charles C. Freeny, Jr.
Title: **SPLIT PERSONAL COMPUTER SYSTEM**
Serial No.: 09/443,125
Filed: 11/18/1999
Atty. Dkt. No.: 2551.032

or suggest a "remote portion" as such term is defined in claims 1 and 18-22 and discussed in the specification.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 18-22 are not anticipated by the Naiff reference. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 18-22 is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are now in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this amendment, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss the same with the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc Brockhaus

Marc A. Brockhaus, Reg. No. 40,923
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
9400 North Broadway, Suite 420
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73114
(405) 478-5344
Attorney for Applicant

C